

# TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

## DRAFT

HELD ON MARCH 17, 2015

### TAB Members Present

Bruce Hallsted, Vice Chairperson  
Ron Wilson  
Michael Schmidt  
Jim LeCheminant  
Kay Henry  
Troy Peterson  
Ian Bennett  
Ian Murray  
David Camp  
Jennifer Love

### TAB Members Absent

Dawn Fortuna, Chairperson

### Others Present

Alan Sanderson  
Lenny Hulme  
Renate Ehm  
Sabine Ellis  
Jim Hash  
Curtis Krausman  
Stephen Ganstrom

Vice Chairperson Bruce Hallsted called the March 17, 2015 Transportation Advisory Board meeting to order at 5:30 pm.

Item 1.        Approval of the minutes of the Transportation Advisory Board meeting held on January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2015.

Board Member Kay Henry moved to approve the minutes as written. Board Member Jim LeCheminant seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Item 2.        Items from citizens present.

None.

Item 3.        Hear a presentation and discuss the 10<sup>th</sup> Street Traffic Calming Project. (Council District 1).

Senior Civil Engineer Curtis Krausman introduced himself to the Board and began his presentation. He explained the 2013 Streets Bond program included the 10<sup>th</sup> Street Traffic Calming Project and went on to describe how the project was intended to help the neighborhood control cut-through traffic on 10<sup>th</sup> Street by vehicles trying to access Alma School Road from Brown Road. Mr. Krausman described the project to-date, explaining the temporary calming measures put in place in February 2015. This pilot program was put in place to see how residents would receive different types of closures and traffic control measures. The majority of the community was not happy with the traffic control measures, and most of the devices were removed. A public meeting was held on March 4<sup>th</sup>, 2015 to gather feedback from the community to identify what they liked and did not like about the February calming measures. Mr. Krausman told the Board 280 responses were being tabulated from a questionnaire distributed at the public meeting that asked about likes and

dislikes of closures and calming measures and provided exhibits showing what some alternative measures may look like. Another public meeting will be held with another proposal for traffic calming on 10<sup>th</sup> Street. Mr. Krausman concluded his presentation and solicited questions from the Board.

Board Member Ian Bennett asked if a report was available to show the number of accidents or fatalities for 10<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mr. Krausman told Board Member Bennett that a report is not available currently, but can be provided.

Board Member Ian Murray asked if speed humps that had been installed slowed traffic down.

Deputy Transportation Director /Traffic Engineer Alan Sanderson explained that the speed humps have proved to be effective over the years where they are installed. Referring to Figure 4 of the presentation provided to the Board, Mr. Sanderson explained that several locations along 10<sup>th</sup> Street had seen a decrease in traffic volume as well as speed over the years since the speed humps were installed (June 1998 thru January 2015). The objections of the neighborhood are attributed to volume going through the area. While the speed humps reduce speed of travel, they do not address traffic volume as effectively as some other measures that could be put in place.

Board Member Ron Wilson asked if the purpose of the calming project was to reduce speed or traffic volumes.

Mr. Sanderson responded that the purpose of the project was for traffic calming. City of Mesa Staff are working to determine what calming means to the affected neighborhood.

Board Member Wilson noted that the issue seems to be related to volume and asked if there was a reason no traffic studies had been done to account for speed and volume.

Mr. Sanderson explained that the process currently underway with the 10<sup>th</sup> Street Traffic Calming project is atypical since it is a Capital Project.

Board Member Wilson asked if a study could be done to evaluate speed and volume.

Mr. Sanderson explained that volume information being requested by Board Member Wilson was provided in Figure 4 and that speed information can be provided as requested. He went on to explain to the Board that this is not a process going through TAB for review, evaluation and decision. While the 10<sup>th</sup> Street project is going through the Capital Project process, Staff wanted the Board to be aware of the project. Mr. Sanderson went on to say the process is being developed as it moves forward.

Board Member David Camp noted the negative results from polling the Santo Tomas and Colonial Manner area of the community after calming measures had been installed and inquired as to what may have caused the negative response and what affect it had on the driving patterns of people in those areas of the community.

Mr. Krausman explained the frustration expressed by the community members was due to the inconvenience of access to Alma School Road.

Board Member Camp sought confirmation that data was not available that provided information on the impact of two closures versus one closure and said that it would have been interesting to see the effect of just having the one closure on 10<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mr. Krausman confirmed the data was not available and explained that the current process would help Staff develop a plan and provide feedback to the community on what works and what does not work.

Mr. Sanderson added that traffic volumes increased substantially on other roads in the neighborhood, including Revere and 8<sup>th</sup> Place, as residents were trying to access Alma School Road.

Board Member Kay Henry stated that the 10<sup>th</sup> Street project is very different than most projects being funded by the 2013 Streets Bond Election.

Mr. Sanderson agreed that the 10<sup>th</sup> Street Calming project was unique and could not recall a similar project having been included in prior Bond elections.

Board Member Henry asked how much money had been allotted for the 10<sup>th</sup> Street Calming project.

Mr. Krausman told the Board that \$1.2 million has been allotted for the project.

Board Member Henry confirmed that Staff had done public outreach prior to installing the traffic calming measures and then asked that the Board be made aware of the next public meeting in the community to observe the community's response. Board Member Henry expressed interest in seeing the conclusion of the project.

Board Member Ian Murray expressed that he felt Staff had provided ample information to the community. He noted from the data that 20.3% of the community members supported the traffic calming measures in place in February and 70.5% did not support the measures.

Mr. Krausman confirmed that Staff received the message from the community that the initial traffic calming measures were too restrictive and they are working to figure out what calming measures will be acceptable.

Board Member Ian Bennett asked why the 10<sup>th</sup> Street Traffic Calming project had not come to the Board prior to implementation.

Mr. Sanderson explained that being a Capital Project, it is being handled by a different process and further expressed that it is a unique project.

Board Member Bennett expressed that due to its unique nature, the project should have been brought to the Board for input to ensure all possible steps are taken.

Vice Chairperson Bruce Hallsted asked if there had been any trip generation study completed and if so, asked where the traffic is coming from; through the Santo Tomas and Colonial Manor neighborhoods or truly cut-through traffic between Country Club Drive and Alma School Road.

Mr. Sanderson explained that a license plate study showed a combination of traffic from the surrounding neighborhoods as well as cut-through traffic for travel between Country Club Drive and Alma School Road. He went on to state the study was completed before the traffic calming measures were put into place. Mr. Sanderson also pointed out that the neighborhood is rather large, and 10<sup>th</sup> Street is a collector, which are factors in the large amount of through traffic.

Board Member Hallsted asked if there would be an opportunity to do a different pilot program and whether or not it was considered to not have the closure at Mountain View Road.

Mr. Sanderson explained that after Engineering finishes compiling comments from the public meeting, Staff will develop options for review and will determine what the next step will be.

Mr. Krausman told the Board that Staff does anticipate having another public meeting and will report the results of that meeting back to Transportation Advisory Board.

Board Member Troy Peterson asked about areas where there are similar situations and was curious to know if Staff anticipates if the 10<sup>th</sup> Street project will encourage other residents in similar areas to pursue a similar type of project.

Mr. Sanderson explained that there are some other collector streets with higher volumes, such as 8th Avenue, Pueblo Avenue and Adobe Road. He went on to explain that those streets are different as they are continuous for several miles across the City. 10<sup>th</sup> Street is a relatively short collector street and shared with the Board that McLellan is another example of a street that is short but has a high volume of traffic. Mr. Sanderson went on to say that 10<sup>th</sup> Street is unique because it is so short and it has such high volumes.

Board Member Peterson explained that he and the Board would be interested in being part of the process if there are similar projects brought up in the future.

Mr. Sanderson explained that the Board is an advisory Board to the City Council and explained that Council may choose to drive their own projects.

Vice Chairperson Hallsted asked for Staff to explain the process for the Bond Election projects and how those projects are selected and prioritized.

Transportation Department Director Lenny Hulme explained that the Bond Election includes projects that Council identifies as items they would like to see in their respective districts. Mr. Hulme went on to say that the 2013 Streets Bond Program has a lot of reconstruction projects and that 10th Street was just another project identified by a Council member that other Council members agreed to include.

Vice Chairperson Hallsted then asked if the projects were identified solely because Council saw a need for them or if Transportation helped to identify projects.

Mr. Hulme explained that the Transportation Department does identify projects that could be addressed through Bond elections in conjunction with the projects Council identifies.

Board Member Kay Henry asked how the approval process will work once the public meetings have concluded.

Mr. Hulme explained that Staff is not sure exactly what the process for approval will be for this project since they are working through a unique process. He went on to say that Staff decided to initiate this pilot program so that community members and others involved could experience different traffic calming measures. Mr. Hulme did point out that the neighborhood was involved in the process and that all devices installed were recycled from other projects. He went on to explain the intent of the pilot program was to get the feedback from the neighborhood since the traffic calming would be a substantial change. He further explained the intent of the pilot program was to address cut-through traffic volume and to divert traffic onto Rio Salado Parkway. Mr. Hulme explained the measures put in place during the pilot program caused problems in other areas, but also allowed the City to show the neighborhood other types of applications that could be put in place. The public meetings afforded the City an opportunity to get feedback from the community on the measures and will prove to be extremely useful as Staff makes alternative recommendations to the community.

Board Member David Camp asked if the Board will have an opportunity to see the data before it is presented to Council.

Mr. Sanderson explained that it depends on the timing chosen by Council members, but expressed if time allowed, Staff would bring the data to the Board prior to it going to Council.

Vice Chairperson Hallsted asked if the budget for the project included a study phase, design and construction.

Mr. Hulme explained the budget was for the whole project cost. He explained that Staff is working to see if the money allotted toward the 10<sup>th</sup> Street Project could also be used to tie in some other programs, like bicycle and pedestrian programs.

Vice Chairperson Hallsted asked if the pilot project had been installed by City forces or if it was contracted out.

Mr. Hulme explained that this pilot project utilized City forces and involved a tremendous amount of coordination by City staff.

Board Member Ron Wilson asked what data would be looked at after this pilot program and the public meetings.

Mr. Krausman explained that the feedback form asked a series of questions to determine which closures and calming measures the neighborhood were in favor of and which they were

not in favor of and also asked for comments regarding what measures they would like to see put in place.

Mr. Sanderson explained that the information that would be compiled is the feedback from the community and will not include speed or volume.

Board Member Wilson shared that the feedback from the community will be appreciated, but expressed that he feels data should be included to support whatever traffic calming measures would be put in place. He went on to say that data will help support the decision that will be made, and while the voice of the neighborhood is important, it should not stand alone.

Item 4. Hear a presentation and discuss the Maricopa Association of Government's (MAG) Regional Pathway Wayfinding Project.

Planner II Jim Hash introduced himself and Alex Oreschak from the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG).

Mr. Oreschak provided the Board with a brief overview of MAG and explained that MAG is responsible for implementation of the Regional Transportation Plan as well as the distribution of federal funding programs. He explained that MAG is governed by cities, towns and so on and presented a map of MAG's jurisdiction which included parts of Pinal County. Mr. Oreschak described for the Board the policy structure and process and explained that decisions are made by a Regional Council which is composed of Mayors from all cities and towns who are informed along the way by the Management Committee who is made of up managers of cities, towns and so on.

Mr. Oreschak went on to tell the Board about the Wayfinding Project introduced through MAG's Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee which includes staff members from various cities and towns who work on bicycle and pedestrian issues. He explained to the Board that a lot of miles of paths are used every day by bicyclists and pedestrians. He informed the Board that many of the existing pathways include very little signage and are not intuitive to navigate. He told the Board that the City of Mesa has done a great job of putting pathway markings up so that people will better understand where they are. Mr. Oreschak presented a map of the existing paved path network to give an idea of how big the regional system is and also to identify gaps and system ends. Mr. Oreschak highlighted the fact that there are limited directions provided along the pathway.

Mr. Oreschak then described to the Board the way in which the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee undertook a study and commissioned contractors to help develop a project to design wayfinding signs and develop a brand for the regional pathway network. He explained the process of branding the pathway as the "Valley Path" and told the Board that an icon will be used on pathways to identify paths that are part of the regional pathway system. Mr. Oreschak described the signage toolbox that member agencies can customize to individual needs and preferences on their own pathways that are part of the regional system. The intent is to create a standardized system that all can understand while traveling the regional pathway. Mr. Oreschak then presented to the Board the different types of signs available, taking into account more cost effective signs as well as optional enhancements available. He went on to explain that a study would be done that will provide recommendations for

placement of signs, including placement diagrams that show different scenarios on pathways, what types of signs would be placed and where, address gap signage and so on. He explained implementation would be phased in over time and would be included in the designs for new projects and in some cases retrofitted for existing pathways. A finalized study is expected to be completed in May with approval from Council in June and then implementation.

Vice Chairperson Hallstead solicited questions from the Board.

Board Member Ian Bennett expressed that, as an avid bike path user in Mesa, he never noticed a lack of signage and feels the pathways in Mesa are fairly clear to figure out.

Mr. Oreschak said that the City of Mesa is one of the better cities in our region that has taken steps to make it very easy to navigate the bicycle and pedestrian pathways. He went on to explain the intent of the wayfinding project is to ensure the region is on the same page and that the pathway is easy for users to find their way from one point to another from any point on the pathway.

Board Member David Camp expressed concern when going from paved pathways to unpaved pathways.

Mr. Oreschak explained that placing signage as recommended may help guide pathway users in the easiest and safest, most comfortable way possible, taking into account those pathways with different standards owned by entities such as SRP as Board Member LeCheminant pointed out.

Board Member Troy Peterson asked if scan bar technology links would be included on signage.

Mr. Oreschak explained that the scan bar codes would take users to an online version of bikeways map.

Board Member Peterson asked if the trailheads would have the scan bar codes.

Mr. Oreschak explained that the Committee would look into that option.

Board Member Ian Bennett expressed the expectation that Staff takes into account and avoids a possible overabundance of signs.

Mr. Oreschak explained that the placement guidelines would encourage minimum signage possible.

Item 5.                   Hear a presentation and discuss Potential Projects for Application to the MAG Design Assistance Program.

Planner II Jim Hash provided a brief overview of the Maricopa Association of Governments Design Assistance Program. Mr. Hash explained to the Board that the City of Mesa has been part of this program since its inception in 1996. In the 2012 City of Mesa's Bike Master Plan, Mr. Hash explained that there are 133 identified projects. The projects were defined through

quantitative and qualitative research methods, which identified gaps and deficiencies based on set criteria and then consideration was taken for the projects that would mean the most to the residents of the City of Mesa and viability. From the 133 projects, the top 40 projects were identified and Staff hopes to work through them during the duration of the horizon year of the Plan. Mr. Hash went on to present to the Board the top 15 projects identified and explained that seven of those are already moving forward to design and development. Mr. Hash then began to explain the priorities for future funding. He identified applying the Complete Streets elements to the Main Street corridor which will address and integrate all transportation modes. Mr. Hash said Staff is looking at the US 60 alignment and explained that there is a drainage corridor currently used for maintenance which could be used as a multi-modal pathway. Mr. Hash explained that Staff has begun looking at the Eastern Canal in its entirety and will start drilling down to establish smaller projects to move forward with.

Vice Chairperson Bruce Hallsted solicited questions from the Board.

Mr. Sanderson shared with the Board that Mr. Hash and his colleague Senior Transportation Engineer Mark Venti are very diligent in seeking out funding sources and taking advantage of the MAG Design Assistance Program to help get these types of projects started.

Mr. Sanderson expressed that the fact that Staff has been able to get these projects started, helps when using and being awarded grants.

Vice Chairperson Hallstead announced to the Board that the agenda items have been completed and that he wanted to thank Alan Sanderson for his service as he is scheduled to retire.

Mr. Sanderson in turn thanked the Board for their service, acknowledged the important role the Board serves to the community, and expressed appreciation for the confidence they have in City of Mesa Staff.

This meeting was adjourned at 6:41 p.m.